

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA

GORDON ROY PARKER,	:	CIVIL ACTION NO. 05-CV-2752
	:	
Plaintiff,	:	
	:	
v.	:	
	:	
LEARN THE SKILLS CORP., et al.,	:	
	:	
Defendants.	:	

**DEFENDANT PAUL ROSS' OPPOSITION TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

Defendant Paul Ross hereby joins in the Oppositions of Co-Defendants Learn the Skills Corp.'s and Trustees of the University of Pennsylvania to the Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration. A motion for reconsideration is governed by a strict standard:

The purpose for a motion for reconsideration is to correct manifest errors of law or fact, or to present newly discovered evidence. *Max's Seafood Cafe v. Max Quinteros*, 176 F.3d 669, 677 (3d Cir. 1999). Thus, a prior decision may be altered or amended only if the party seeking reconsideration establishes at least one of the following grounds: (1) an intervening change in controlling law; (2) the availability of new evidence that was not available when the district court decided the motion under consideration; or (3) the need to correct a clear error of law or fact or to prevent manifest injustice. *Id.* (citing *N. River Ins. Co. v. CIGNA Reinsurance Co.*, 52 F.3d 1194, 1218 (3d Cir. 1995)).

Fassl v. Our Lady of Perpetual Help, 2006 U.S. Dist. LEXIS 11054, 7-8 (E.D. Pa. 2006).

Motions for reconsideration are only "sparingly" granted. *Id.*, quoting *Continental Casualty Co. v. Diversified Indus., Inc.*, 884 F. Supp. 937, 943 (E.D. Pa. 1995), citing *Rottmund v. Continental Assurance Co.*, 813 F. Supp. 1104, 1107 (E.D. Pa. 1992).

On this motion, Plaintiff raises no intervening change of law and supplies the Court with no new facts. Nor, with respect to Defendant Ross, does Plaintiff contend the motion is

necessary to correct a manifest error of law. At most, Plaintiff re-argues that which he argued on the prior consideration by the Court. Plaintiff's motion is insufficient to warrant reconsideration.

BUCHANAN INGERSOLL PC
Respectfully submitted,

By: /s/ Mary Kay Brown
Mary Kay Brown
Shernese V. Woodbine
Pa. I.D. Nos. 54327 and 91209
1835 Market Street, 14th Floor
Philadelphia, PA 19103
(215) 665-3671

Attorneys for Defendant Paul Ross

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on this 3rd day of May, 2006, I caused the foregoing Defendant Paul Ross' Opposition to the Plaintiff's Motion for Reconsideration, to be served by first-class U.S. mail, postage prepaid, upon the following:

Gordon Roy Parker, *pro se* Plaintiff
4247 Locust Street, #806
Philadelphia, PA 19104

Dennis G. Young, Jr., Esquire
Montgomery, McCracken, Walker & Rhoads, LLP
123 South Broad Street
Philadelphia, PA 19109

Matthew S. Wolf, Esquire, *pro se* Defendant
241 Kings Highway East
Haddonfield, NJ 08033

/s/ Mary Kay Brown
Mary Kay Brown